

Serial No 09/559,204
In reply to Office Action mailed March 23, 2004
Page 6 of 8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application, and claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 14 are currently amended. Such amendments are fully supported by the specification. For at least the reasons stated below, Applicant asserts that all claims are in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Step (a) of claim 1 recites, "accessing tax-related forms..." and step (d)—which was formerly step (b)—of claim 1 has been amended to recite, "completing the tax-related forms..." These changes obviate the rejection, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miller* (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,052). Applicant respectfully opposes these rejections.

The present invention generally provides for a network-based tax service database interface, including the following elements:

- (a) accessing tax-related forms in a governmentally maintained forms database, wherein the tax-related forms include a plurality of fields;
- (b) accessing a revenue services database, wherein the revenue services database stores tax return data in duplicate, in a first table on the revenue services database and in a second table on the revenue services database;
- (c) extracting a portion of the tax return data from the revenue services database, such that the extracted tax return data is provided to a legacy processing system from the first table and the extracted tax return data is provided to a corporate information database from the second table;
- (d) completing the tax-related forms, wherein at least a portion of the plurality of fields are filled based on the tax return data, such that the tax return data on which field filling is based is extracted from both the legacy processing system and a succeeding processing system, and wherein the revenue services database mirrors data tables on the succeeding processing system; and
- (e) submitting the tax-related forms to a governmental entity, wherein the tax-related forms are formatted based on rules associated with the governmental entity.

Serial No 09/559,204

In reply to Office Action mailed March 23, 2004

Page 7 of 8

The cited reference fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations as required by MPEP § 2143. Therefore, this rejection is unsupported by the art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection.

Specifically, the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least (a) storing tax return data on a database in duplicate; and (b) causing a revenue services database to mirror data tables from another processing system.

(a) STORING TAX RETURN DATA ON A DATABASE IN DUPLICATE

The present claimed invention recites a revenue services database that stores tax return data in duplicate on a first table and a second table. Moreover, each of the two tables serves a different purpose: tax return data extracted from the first table goes to a legacy processing system—e.g., a core processing system or “existing systems”—and tax return data extracted from the second table goes to a corporate information database—e.g., a corporate information facility (CIF). *See*, Specification, pp. 15-16, 123-24; Figs. 4, 30 (describing the storage of returns data in duplicate on the ROS database in two tables, one for extract to CIF and one for extract to core processing systems). This feature of the present claimed invention, *inter alia*, enables data extraction for the corporate information database and the legacy processing system to be performed independently of one another.

Miller fails to teach or suggest such duplicate storage of tax return data on a single database let alone two tables on the single database, extracted data from which is provided to a legacy processing system and a corporate information database.

(b) CAUSING THE DATABASE TO MIRROR DATA TABLES FROM ANOTHER PROCESSING SYSTEM

The present claimed invention further recites filling fields based on tax return data extracted from both the legacy processing system and a succeeding processing system, and wherein the revenue services database mirrors data tables on the succeeding processing system. The revenue services database follows the same database design approach as the succeeding processing system—e.g., an integrated taxation processing system (ITP)—which positions the revenue services database for the future when major taxes are included in the succeeding processing system. *See*, pp. 137-38; Figs. 30-32. This alignment of the revenue services database with the succeeding processing system, *inter alia*, facilitates the introduction of new taxes and forms onto the revenue services database and minimizes the maintenance costs associated with the revenue services database because code

Serial No 09/559,204
In reply to Office Action mailed March 23, 2004
Page 8 of 8

developed for the succeeding processing system can be reused as the next generation succeeding processing system becomes increasingly integrated into the network-based tax services. *Id.*

Miller and the other art of record fail to teach or suggest such alignment of the revenue services database and data tables on a succeeding processing system.

Because the cited reference fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of claims 1-15, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's § 103 rejections be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (612) 607-7386.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees including fees for any extension of time, to Deposit Account No. 50-1901 (Reference 60021-357801).

Respectfully submitted,

By


Christopher R. Hilberg, Reg. No. 48,740
Customer No. 29838

Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly, LLP
45 South Seventh St.
Plaza VII, Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1609
Telephone: 612-607-7386
Facsimile: 612-607-7100
E-mail: CHilberg@oppenheimer.com